[p.5-B]

193 possibilities of suffix combination. Every word in Yokuts, except the uninflected particle, must have at least one suffix, and the great majority of words occurring in the several volumes of text dictated by my informants do not go beyond this minimum requirement. Words containing two suffixes are fairly common; but words with three suffixes are relatively rare, and those with more than three are practically nonexistent in the texts. This is not a matter of mere statistics; it is a manifestation of selective forces in Yokuts that limit the free application of its grammatical resources. There is no analogous tendency in English to set upper and lower limits to the use of suffixation and to demand that a uniform degree of suffix elaboration be applied to words. As a matter of fact, English does not seek economy or uniformity in the use of any of its grammatical materials. In spite of the fact that we generally look outside the word unit to syntax for the creation of notional complexes, we feel no more strain in a lavishly suffixed word, such as "nationalistically" with its six suffixes, than in a suffixless word, such as "state."

124 193 An instructive exercise that I indulged in during my Yokuts field work was to construct words having four or five suffixes and to ask the informant for a translation. Although such words complied with the grammatical rules and could be translated by my informant without any difficulty, they seldom failed to provoke his amusement. It was obvious that these words were impossibly heavy and elaborate. To the Yokuts feeling for simplicity they were grammatical monstrosities.

193 196 The concepts expressed by the suffixes are abstract in nature. Yokuts does not possess the types of formative element, so familiar in many American Indian languages, that convey notions of concrete instrumentality, such as "with the hand" and "with a stick," or notions of specific location, such as "on the shore" and "in the house." The suffixes of Yokuts have more the character of algebraic symbols; their content is schematic rather than material. Among the verb suffixes, for example, are those defining an event as durative, continuative, repetitive, causative, reciprocal, passive, subordinate, undifferentiated past or present; future. The most common noun suffixes refer to case relations, marking the subject, direct object, and indirect object, or denoting possession, location, and the like. Particularized and concrete meanings are not expressed through the suffixes in Yokuts.

Even the stems, which are the only elements in Yokuts that can specify the material details of reference, show a strong tendency to carve out broad and comprehensive meanings from the referential field. The vocabulary of verb stems is largely made up of such diffuse and generalized notions as "come," "go," "walk," "run," "hear," "see," "smell." When suffixes with their abstract meanings are joined to stems whose referential content is so inclusive, the resulting words con-

[p. 6-A]

193 tain notions that are generalized. Although
196 English is well stocked with words expressing notions of this kind, it also has an extensive vocabulary whose words are packed with delicate overtones of meaning. It can add subtle nuances to the general notion of "walk" by using such terms as "stroll," "saunter," "stride," "pace," "march," "tread," "plod," "hobble," "limp," "toddle." There is nothing like this in Yokuts. A book of Yokuts synonyms would be poor indeed. The language is not well equipped, either in its stems or in its formative elements, to build word units that are conceptually detailed or that express refinements and shadings of meaning.

195 Nor are the broad concepts of Yokuts words sharpened by special figurative uses. A stubborn literalness of reference invades the entire language. The shifts and extensions of meaning that add pungency and vigor to English play no part in Yokuts style. Such phrases as "to strike the eye," "to strike a bargain," "a sharp tongue," "a sharp appetite," "the family tree," "the tree of knowledge" illustrate the English genius for employing terms transferred from their literal sense. But in Yokuts a tree is a tree and nothing more. The language does not permit its words to cut metaphorical capers.

By exploiting the metaphorical possibilities of English words and by drawing upon our vocabulary of finely nuanced words, we can achieve variety and nicety of expression. Manuals of English style are merely underlining the potentialities inherent in the language when they encourage the student in his frantic efforts to avoid repetitions of the same word in close proximity. Although we may regard variety as an absolute virtue of style and repetition as a universal sin, it is obvious that Yokuts cannot be driven in this direction. The broad area of reference covered by Yokuts words gives them a wide range of application, and their literal significance holds them austerely within their proper boundaries of reference. It would be flying in the face of these forces in Yokuts to seek variety by ringing delicate changes upon a recurring notion. When a notion is to be repeated, there is no need to avoid verbal repetition. A passage such as, "And he walked home. And his friend also walked home. And the people walked home," however monotonous and slovenly it may appear to English sensibilities, is stylistically appropriate in Yokuts.

192 Yokuts possesses a special class of verbs
196 which, in contrast to the generalized concepts typical of the language, express notions that are narrowly defined and specific. The following examples illustrate the kind of notions conveyed by this class of verbs.

ɬubwiyi, "strike a flat object to the ground."
wipwiyi, "make a slow bending motion upward" (as branches bending upward in the wind).
bidinwiyi, "tumble from a high place."

[P.6-B]

192 xapap'wiyi, "get spread out in a fanlike formation."
196 no·mno·'wiyi, "make puckering motions in and out."

192 The stylistic possibilities of these verbs for
195 creating vivid images in a concentrated manner is obvious; but not so obvious to English feeling, which delights in flashes of sharp imagery, is the sense of violence and bizarreness which these verbs suggest to the Yokuts stylistic consciousness.

193 From the perspective of Yokuts, these verbs
195 are linguistic freaks. Their grammatical form, as well as their content, is anomalous in the Yokuts system. These verbs are composed of two elements, a stem of the verb wiyi, "do, do thus," being added to another stem defining the nature of the activity. The technique of stem composition, displayed in these "do" verbs, occurs nowhere else in the language. Furthermore, a number of the "do" verbs, particularly those referring to specific sounds, contain a stem having
[192] an onomatopoetic force: ga·gwiyi, "cackle," tuhwiyi, "spit," 'uhwiyi, "cough," hilwiyi, "make a hiccuping sound," niwwiyi, "whistle through the air." Such mimetic play with sounds is not only absent elsewhere in the language, but it is out of keeping with the severe formalism of Yokuts. In their meanings, in their form, and in their phonetic mimicry, these verbs seem to be cut to the pattern of a foreign idiom. They are like an ornate Byzantine mosaic set in a Calvinistic church.

192 It is a significant comment on the directive
195 tendencies of historical drift in language that
197 these eccentric "do" verbs have been leveled out of most of the modern Yokuts dialects. Only a few petrified noun derivatives are left in these dialects to indicate that the "do" verbs were formerly common throughout Yokuts. Only in one dialect, Yauelmani, have they been found as a fully operative and productive set of verbs. But they have a peculiar status in this dialect: they are regarded as the linguistic property of chil-
124 dren. I did not become aware of this class of
192 verbs until, after two or three weeks of field
195 work, I overheard some remarks which my informant's eight-year-old son was addressing to himself. Only with the greatest difficulty could I coax my informant to explain the "do" verb which his child had used and to give me further examples of this class. It was evident that he regarded
[191] words of this type as being too silly for serious
[885] discussion and totally out of keeping with the essential sobriety of adulthood. Not until some time later did he tell me that these words were used primarily by children. But even after he had overcome his reluctance to discuss the "do" verbs, he was never able to treat them seriously. A spirit of facetiousness always accompanied our work with them.

195 The myths do not contain many examples of the
538